

Remarks

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claims 4 and 8 have been amended to recite that the heat-radiation-preventive coating film is applied onto substantially the entire surface of one side of the glass substrate. It is apparent, from the context of the specification, that Applicant had possession of this aspect of the invention at the time the application was filed, and therefore, the specification does provide a written description of the subject matter of the proposed amended claims. This is essentially the test for satisfying the written description requirement of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 (MPEP 2163, section IIA). That is, the specification is directed to a glass which prevents heat radiation, and there are repeated references in the specification to forming a coating film “on one side of a glass substrate” (e.g. page 4, last line) to prevent heat radiation (e.g. item (9) on page 9). The amended claims are thus fully supported by the specification as filed.

Each of claims 4 and 8 has been further amended to revise formula (I) to omit the oxygen atom before the R₁, R₂ and R₃ groups. It is clear from the application as originally filed that each of the R groups already includes an oxygen atom, it being noted that the claims require that each R group is hydroxy or a group capable of generating a silanol upon hydrolysis. For example, if each R group is hydroxy, this would involve - OOH groups which are attached to the silicon atom, which is clearly an inadvertent error. Deleting the oxygen atom from the formula corrects this error.

New claim 25 has been added to the application, and corresponds to claim 10 except that claim 25 includes the additional recitation that the heat-radiation-preventive glass is disposed so that the heat-radiation-preventive coating film becomes the outermost layer substantially on the entire surface of the heat-radiation-preventive glass. This means that the heat-radiation-preventive glass is used without any further coating onto the heat-radiation-preventive coating film, which is supported by the specification in general.

The patentability of the presently claimed invention over the disclosure of the reference relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims will be apparent upon consideration of the following remarks.

The rejection of claims 4, 8, 10 and 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated or suggested by Angeline is respectfully traversed.

In the Angeline reference, the primer composition of the reference is applied **only near the edges** of a windshield (column 7, lines 23-25). This is essentially noted by the Examiner in connection with the comments in the first full paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action, referring to the use of an adhesive between the glass and the substrate (automobile body) in the Angeline reference, apparently having reference to the disclosure at column 4, lines 39-45 of the reference. It would make no sense, for the object of the reference, to apply the primer composition over the entire surface of the windshield, which as noted by Angeline, is a nonporous substrate. The function of the primer and sealant is to seal out water from entering around the edges of the windshield into the interior of the automobile.

On the other hand, as set forth in amended claim 4, the heat-radiation-preventive coating film is applied onto **substantially the entire surface** of one side of the glass substrate; and similarly, in amended claim 8, which is the only other independent claim, the heat-radiation-preventive coating material is coated onto **substantially the entire surface** of one side of the glass substrate. This feature of the invention, and thus the entire invention as a whole, is neither disclosed in, nor suggested by, the Angeline reference.

As indicated above, new claim 25 requires that the heat-radiation-preventive coating film becomes the outermost layer substantially on the entire surface of the heat-radiation-preventive glass, which means that there is no additional coating on the heat-radiation-preventive coating film. If the heat-radiation-preventive glass of the present invention is used accompanied by coating some material, such as a sealant described in Angeline, onto the surface of the film, the heat-radiation-preventive effect cannot be achieved because it is necessary for the heat-radiation-preventive coating layer to contact the air so as to radiate heat from the coating layer to the air.

Accordingly, Applicant takes the position that the presently claimed invention is clearly patentable over the reference.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the ground of rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Masami KUJIRAI

By:



Michael R. Davis

Registration No. 25,134

Attorney for Applicant

MRD/pth
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 13, 2007